



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,464	06/14/2001	James L. Knighten	9793	7522

26890 7590 03/18/2004

JAMES M. STOVER  
NCR CORPORATION  
1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD, WHQ4  
DAYTON, OH 45479

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/881,464

Applicant(s)

KNIGHTEN ET AL.

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11-17-03
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-21, 24-30, 32-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected. 1, 3-21, 24-30, 32-41
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11-17-03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

PTO-1449, items A,B, patents should be cited when data known.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim 32, dependency 7 is incorrect.

Claim 12, line 11, should "a" be – the --.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9-11, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimura in view of Kuo, Reuss and Young.

Yoshimura figs. 1-3 discloses an assembly with cover 40, 30 about connector 20 and having a cable engaging part 47 for clamping a cable shield 72, and attachment means 60, fig. 1, 3 and see fig. 7. The shield lacks specific disclosure of chassis attachment means and lacks a conductive gasket. Kuo, figs. 1, 5, 6 shows connectors with chassis attachment means. Young shows use of a gasket at 14. Obvious to use these features in Yoshimura assembly to help secure the connector to the chassis and to better ground the shield to the chassis. Yoshimura screws 60 could be used for chassis attachment just as Kuo screws 51 are used.

Reuss applied, should issues arise, to show connector within a cover at 16, 2, 17. Obvious to similarly form the Yoshimura assemblies.

Claims 34 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimura in view of Kuo, Reuss, Young and Blonder.

The references are applied as above. Yoshimura does not include piercing means. Blonder discloses use of piercing means at 19'.

It would have been obvious to use such means in the Yoshimura assembly at part 47 to contact the cable shield in a reliable manner.

Claims 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandler in view of Van Doorn.

Chandler figs. 3B 8 discloses a method using connector housing 70, 100 joined to cable shield 184. Chandler housing 70, 100 lacks a conductive shroud contacted to the cable.

Van Doorn at 42 shows a shroud enclosing a shielded (coax) connector and contacting the cable 14. Obvious to use such shroud in Chandler, fig. 8 system to provide improved EMI shielding. For claims 25, 29 the recited capacitive impedance would inherently be present as signals are passed in cable 180. The predetermined frequency has not been shown to distinguish over standard operation of electronic systems.

Such capacitive coupling is seen to provide electrical connection; this aspect, not being at issue in last response.

For claim 14, see above discussion, in addition, shroud 42 of Van Doorn is shown to engage the chassis, figs. 1B, 6, 7.

Claims 8, 12-32, 35-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Livingston in view of Goodman, Yoshimura, and Blonder.

Yoshimura assembly includes chassis and port 3 (32), connector 18, cover (shield) 8, 9, attachment mechanism 12 and cable engagement body (neck) 10. The cable engagement body 10 does not surround the cable outer shield 7 or for claims 8, 27, 28, etc include piercing means. Blonder at 19, 21 discloses a shield surrounding a cable and having piercing means 19'. Yoshimura includes cable clamp part 47. Obvious to form Livingston part 1'0 to surround the cable and for claims 8, 27, 28, etc to pierce the cable in view of Yoshimura and Blonder.

Art Unit: 2839

Blonder parts 19" 19, 21 are read as defining an opening for cable 3.

For claim 12 assembly parts 17 and 8, 9 each contact a cable shield. Note that claim 12 reads on two shield cable use as in Livingston. For claim 14, it seems obvious to omit direct coupling and to capacitive couple shield (omit parts 19' of Blonder). Such aspect is not subject to arguments in last response. Also capacitive coupling between part 10 and cable shield 5 would produce no new or unexpected result over direct connection.

Claims 24, 25 also met by above combination.

For claim 26, 29, Livingston cable has a shield 5, 7, the parts 17 and 8, 9 engaging such shield. The term shield does not define over presence of two shields 5, 7 as in Livingston. Nor would it be unobvious to join shroud 8, 9 to the same shield of a single shield cable. No new result is obtained by such change. Change to Livingston by use of only one cable shield (5) and joining 8, 9, 10 to that shield would be obvious simplification of patent assembly. For claim 41, obvious to use a gasket in Livingston in view of Goodman at 36.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment and pertinent to above rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. \*\*\*.

As to request for translation the German patent is very clear as to use of pins 32, etc to cut through a cable shield. For such use, which is not at issue, no translation is believed necessary. However, Blonder is now applied to show the feature at issue.

For claim 1, while Yoshimura does not disclose gasket use, such feature is clearly suggested by Young and would be readily applicable to Yoshimura device. For

Art Unit: 2839

claim 24, arguments, Yoshimura shroud 50 was adequate for original claim terminology.

Other arguments are moot in view of changes to claims and use of new references.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Abrams Neil at telephone number (571)272-2089.

  
NEIL ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2839